

On
Syn
the
all
God

and
the
Ritu
will
of E
matic

ual,"
errors
has fr
desire
vain to
or to h
are the
we pro
the let
Comm

If
o belie
were no
Associat
Lord Bi
a this c
nately
etween
athedra
nose un
perfectly
his will

Church Association of the Diocese of Toronto.

OCCASIONAL PAPER, NO. VIII.

THE SOURCE OF OUR UNHAPPY DIVISIONS.

It has been the practice within this Diocese, long before the Church Association was formed, to begin the daily sessions of the Synod with this prayer:—"Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great danger we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from Godly unity and concord."

In June last the Synod, "deploing the existence of dissensions and differences in the Church," affirmed them to be "caused by the unfortunate introduction of innovations and novelties in the Ritual," and expressed "its hope that the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity will unite in preserving in its simple form, the Ritual of the Church of England, and the doctrines handed down to us from the Reformation."

This "introduction of innovations and novelties in the Ritual," and their connection with the revival of grave doctrinal errors, constitute the one subject to which the Church Association has from the first earnestly invited attention. Those who really desire a restoration of Godly unity and concord must see that it is vain to disguise any longer the real source of our unhappy divisions; or to hope for peace until it is removed. Believing then that they are the truest friends of peace who expose the source of discord, we proceed once more to review the subject as presented to us in the letter of the Lord Bishop to the Lay members of the Executive Committee of this Association.

If the novelties referred to amounted—as some would have us to believe,—only to a more or less ornate and musical service, and were not the outward signs of grave doctrinal error, the Church Association would never have been called into existence. The Lord Bishop is pleased to say:—"The Church of the Holy Trinity at this city is adduced as practising a 'high ritual.' It is unfortunately the fact that those who assert this, make no distinction between an ordinary choral service simply conducted, as it is in the Cathedral or Collegiate Churches of the United Kingdom, and those unauthorized novelties which have been foisted upon that perfectly lawful manner of conducting the services of the Church." His will be best answered by reviewing what follows.

SISTERHOOD OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST.

His Lordship next takes up the "Sisterhood of St. John the Baptist" as one of "the assumed delinquencies of the Church of the Holy Trinity," and thus proceeds:—

"In reference to what you have cited as to the employment of certain of the Sisters in preparations for the Holy Communion, Mr. Darling, at my request, has furnished me with the following explanations:—'It is sad, indeed, that out of a multitude of good works enumerated in the Report (for last year), under no less than sixteen heads, the Church Association can find nothing to commend; and should fix upon the fact that the altar linen is taken care of, and the elements for the Holy Communion prepared by Sister Sarah, as a ground of offence and accusation.'"

The remark of Mr. Darling is calculated to mislead. So far from ignoring the good works enumerated in the Report, the words used were these:—"While, as in many Romish sisterhoods, this 'Sisterhood of S. John the Baptist' aims at works of piety and 'charity, we read in its report for the past year that 'The Altar linen' used in the Church of the Holy Trinity is washed and ironed at 'the House; the bread for the celebration of the Holy Communion' provided; and Sister Sarah has the care of the Altar, which occupies 'one afternoon each week.'"

We once more press on the attention of the Lord Bishop, and of all the members of our Church, that practices are here avowed and defended, which, so far from pertaining to "an ordinary choral service simply conducted," may best be characterized in the Bishop's own words, as "unauthorized novelties foisted upon the services of the Church."

1st. There is not only the misapplication of the word "Altar" to the Communion Table,—the reversal of a change of the most significant character, made at the Reformation as one of the distinctive marks of the Protestant Church of England;—but this word "Altar" is here the accompaniment of other changes, giving a most ominous significance to the revival of this term borrowed from the services of the Church of Rome.

2nd. There is the novelty—unheard of till now in Canada at least,—of a "Sister," the member of a "Church Sisterhood," having the so-called "Altar" of a Protestant Church committed to her care. The very need of such novel services is suggestive of something more than the ordinary Communion Table, with its fair white linen cloth.

3rd. There is the still more significant novelty of this Sisterhood making bread specially "for the celebration of the Holy Com-

munion;" or, as Mr. Darling expresses it, seeing "that the elements are duly and reverently prepared for their holy use."

On this point, at least, the rubrics are clear and specific. We read in the Communion service: "*And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition*, which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and Wine, it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten." What then is the value of a cry for "Peace," or prayer that God will be pleased to take away whatever may hinder us from Godly unity; if with such a rubric before us, warning against such an "occasion of dissension and superstition," our Clergy are nevertheless, not only permitted, but encouraged to substitute for "bread such as is usual to be eaten," bread "reverently prepared for holy use" by a Sisterhood, the members of which—as we learn from the Report of the "Sisterhood of St. John the Baptist,"—are "admitted formally by the Bishop as members of the Community, and sent forth with his Episcopal Benediction."

Just such a distinction is made between the Wafer for the mass of the Church of Rome, and common bread; the former being, as we are assured, reverently prepared for holy use by the Nuns.

If any one is still disposed to say that we make no distinction between the ordinary simple services of the Church and unauthorized novelties, then we may cease to wonder at the open announcement that the Mass and Prayers for the Dead have been revived in the Church in this Diocese; for these are not more "unauthorized novelties" than those already specified. All alike, though differing in degree, are an undoing of the work accomplished by our Church at the Reformation.

TRINITY COLLEGE AND THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL.

Next, as to Trinity College and Trinity College School, which the Lord Bishop properly classes together, as thoroughly identified. In referring to the former it is not easy to avoid the seeming implication of one individual in results which may prove to be due more or less to other influences, owing to the fact that he constitutes the whole theological faculty in the College. But we are bound to give full prominence to the distinct disclaimers of the Rev. Provost, who disavows the teaching of the grave errors we have referred to; and denies all encouragement or sympathy with ritualistic excesses. Further, in referring to the "Christian's Manual," he says, "I am very sorry that the gentlemen who have attached their names to that letter should have stated that they believe its teaching to be the teaching of Trinity College."

This disclaimer should have every weight given to it, since the Rev. Provost here disavows the teachings of a work sent forth with the Lord Bishop's approval; and anew pronounced by him, "after a careful perusal," not only to contain nothing objectionable, but to be eminently fitted for the devotional companion of young and old. Nevertheless, that the belief entertained, not only as to the objectionable fruits ascribed to the teaching of Trinity College, but as to the responsibility of the Provost for them, rested on grounds sufficient to justify the credit given to it, will we think be apparent when it is stated that the evidence of the use of the "Christian's Manual" at the Trinity College School of Port Hope,—the author of which is one of its masters,—was placed seemingly beyond all dispute by the production to us of a copy of the book given to one of the pupils, and having his name written on it by the Rev. C. J. S. Bethune, Head Master of that school, along with his own initials. The Provost says he never heard of the book "until he saw it mentioned in the letter of the Executive Committee." We can only say that our information is that the Provost of Trinity College is not only a member of the Governing Board, but he has been the examiner in Divinity in the Port Hope School since it was opened. We do not question the statement of the Provost as to his ignorance of the manual in use. How far as an examiner he could remain in ignorance of its teachings must, of course, depend on the process of examination there pursued.

MASTERS OF TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL.

What we have already stated is that the tree must be judged by its fruits. We find a school established in special and most intimate connection with Trinity College, and its head master, a graduate of that University, is found placing in the hands of his pupils "The Christian's Manual." Another of its graduates, the author of this manual,—and to whose views a marked publicity had been given by his sermon, preached in recent years before the Synod, in which, among other things, he strongly advocated union with the Greek Church,—has been selected as one of its masters. We are also told by the Lord Bishop that in the daily services of the school chapel "Their admirable choir is not surpassed by that of any parish church; "and he specially enumerates in the school work: "the confirmation class steadily kept up, and representing its results "at the close of each Lent term;—the preparation of the confirmed for "the Holy Communion."

PREPARATION FOR COMMUNION.

How the pupils are prepared for the Holy Communion will presently appear. The manual is dedicated to the Lord Bishop

"with his permission and approval," and is styled in full: "The Christian's Manual: being a Book of Directions and Devotions to be used daily, and especially in preparing for the Holy Communion." In our former quotations from this manual we were restrained by the desire to confine a letter addressed to the Lord Bishop within reasonable limits. The censure to which this has given rise renders it indispensable that we should now quote at greater length. This will supply the best answer to the charges of "wretchedly garbled extracts," and "the citation of passages culled with more astuteness than honesty."

Of the Manual his Lordship says: "I can say that after a careful perusal of it, I could find nothing that could fairly be strained as objectionable; nothing certainly in its language or spirit that indicates the remotest tendency to the erroneous teachings of the Church of Rome. Its selection of prayers and meditations, its scripture extracts, its touching and beautiful hymns, its whole tone of chastened piety and pure sentiment, render it a devotional companion, by the habitual use of which young and old could not fail to be benefited."

ERRONEOUS TEACHING.

After such an unqualified approval of this work, it is with deep sorrow that we feel ourselves thus called upon to set forth the evidence which forced on our own minds so very different a conclusion.

Of this Manual we do not hesitate to say that many passages of a pious and devotional character, as well as beautiful hymns, collects from the Book of Common Prayer, and portions of Sacred Scripture, are to be found in its pages. But those only render the more dangerous the erroneous teaching which is mingled therewith; all leading to the grand error involved in modern Ritualism, viz., a return to the medieval superstition of an altar, a perpetual sacrifice, and a real presence of Christ's Body accompanying the consecration of the bread and wine. All this practically tends to a revival of the grievous error denounced in such exceptionally strong terms in Article XXXI of our Prayer Book.

In order to meet the requirements of the Lord Bishop's letter, we here substitute for the briefer extract formerly given, the entire passage on p. 21 of the Manual: "There are three most erroneous views spoken of in connection with the holy sacrament, which the foregoing exposition of Holy Scripture guards against:—

"1. That wherein it has been said that such a change in the substance of the elements was asserted as to leave no bread and wine, but only the real body and blood of Christ in a carnal manner.

"2. That wherein no body or blood of Christ was held to be really present in any strict sense; that, in fact, there were really present only the 'symbols' of his body and blood; or, to express it in a grosser form, the body and blood of Christ were really absent.

"Both these opinions destroy the sacramental character of the ordinance; the first, by leaving no outward sign; the second, by allowing no 'inward part,' or inward and spiritual gift, thus leading to the error condemned by the Apostle of unworthy receiving, because 'not discerning the Lord's body.'

"3. Consubstantiation, or the confounding or mingling of the Lord's body and blood with the bread and wine."

In referring to this portion of the Manual in the letter to the Lord Bishop, it was not thought necessary to produce paragraphs 1 and 3, as they are manifestly designed as protests against errors of other Churches. But, as the whole is called for, we must ask in what sense we are to understand the doctrine of "*Consubstantiation, or the confounding, or mingling of the Lord's body and blood with the bread and wine*" to be false; and yet accept as true and Scriptural teaching such passages as these: "When you receive the Holy Bread—the BODY of your SAVIOUR," p. 98; "When you receive the BODY of the LORD," &c., p. 99; "As I have now received in faith Thy precious Body and Blood, veiled under the form of bread and wine," p. 99. It requires some more subtle distinction than we are capable of defining to discriminate between the two forms of error.

In Cranmer's answer to Gardiner, he says: "I say that the Papists do teach that Christ is in the visible signs, and whether they list to call them bread and wine, or the forms of bread and wine, all is one to me; for the truth is that He is neither corporally in the bread and wine, nor in or under the forms and figures of them, but is corporally in Heaven, and spiritually in his lively members, which be His temple where he inhabiteth." Again he says: "As concerning the form of doctrine 'used in the Church of England in the Holy Communion that the body and blood of Christ be under the forms of bread and wine,' when you shall shew the place where the form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that which in the mean time I take to be a plain untruth." Such is the clear testimony of the Martyr Bishop, who perished at the stake in defence of the very truth which he thus contended for, against the notorious persecutor, Gardiner.

It was this revived form of the old error, as now systematically taught by the Ritualists of our own Church, with which we were dealing; and our former quotation set that forth fully. Since,

however, we are accused of withholding the context, it will be better to go even beyond the Bishop's requirements, and produce the immediately preceding passage which thus sets forth "The

OFFICE OF THE EARTHLY PRIEST.

"It is the office of the earthly priest thus commissioned,

"I. To receive offerings from the people, and present them solemnly upon God's Altar.

"II. To take, according to God's ordinance, an unbloody offering, called, in Malachi i. 2, 'a pure offering,' or, as the Septuagint renders it, 'a pure sacrifice' of bread and wine, and in a solemn, priestly act so consecrate it that, by the Word of God, and power of the Holy Ghost, the elements may be the Body and Blood of Christ; this blessed effect being not the act of the earthly priest, but the act of Christ: it being Jesus Himself Who says, by the mouth of His earthly priest, 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' and as it was 'through the Eternal Spirit' that Christ 'offered Himself without spot to God,' so by the same Spirit, and by God's ordinance alone, not through any earthly power, is it that without change of substance, but in a spiritual and sacramental way, the bread and wine, thus consecrated, become 'verily and indeed' the Body and Blood of Christ, after an heavenly and spiritual manner, to be there 'discerned,' and to be 'given, taken and eaten;' so that Christ is really, though not carnally present, after a mysterious and supernatural manner; and being so present, is set forth as the One, True and Only Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. Thus is pleaded before God the Father the merits and satisfaction of the Son. Thus is represented the Death of Christ until His coming again.

"This Body and Blood of Christ having been thus presented before the Father in this Memorial of Christ's own ordaining, is then delivered to the faithful to convey to them spiritual nourishment and blessed healing.

"In *these* particular priestly acts the people have no *immediate* share. Such acts require imperatively and absolutely a duly commissioned priest of God. The very greatness of the mystery involved, the awful nearness into which we are brought to the INCARNATE GOD, as well as the unutterable depth of the blessing to be had in this Holy Sacrament, all speak loudly as to the necessity of a sure authority in those who minister, and also of a reverent care and preparedness of heart in those who come to be ministered unto." pp. 19-20.

We give the passages, with all their emphatic capitals, italics, &c., as in the original.

OFFICE OF THE PEOPLE.

This is the office of the Priest. But the office of the people is also thus defined :—

"Now, first, in the general Eucharistic Service, the whole baptised Christian people who form the great royal priesthood of believers in Christ, and who have been set apart by the 'laying on of hands,' both clergy and people have a sacred service (*sacrificium*) which all join in performing."

Next as to their offerings ; they are to give themselves, and then what they possess :—

"1. Alms, recognizing God's ownership of that of which they are stewards.

"2. Oblations, giving Him back of the fruits of the earth, as an acknowledgment that He is the Giver and Sustainer of all things ; offering bread and wine as His 'pure offering' spoken of by His prophet Malachi, to be for ever offered, 'from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof.' So the former Melchisedec brought forth, in type, 'bread and wine,' and he was the priest of the most high God.

"3. Renewed offering of prayer, praise, devotion, and thanksgiving—Post Communion service.

"But, secondly, in a more special and ministerial manner, there is a priestly act by the consecrated Priest of God."

We can well imagine the simple young Christian sorely puzzled what he is really to believe or understand, out of all this mystical confusing of Malachi's "pure offering," the Septuagint's "pure sacrifice," "the priestly acts of a duly commissioned Priest of God," and "Oblations of the fruits of the earth." We find no such mystical obscuration of the beautiful and simple Sacrament instituted by Christ, whether we turn to the Bible, or to the Prayer Book. In the latter we read : that the Father did give His "only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption ; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world ; and did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death until His coming again." The Prayer Book is a simple condensation of what is set forth more at large in Holy Scripture. We look in vain for any hint of "Oblations of the fruits of the earth," "pure offerings," or a "pure sacrifice of bread and wine." We do indeed read in the prayer for the Church Militant, which immediately follows the taking up of the offertory :

"We humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations," but that this has no reference to the bread and wine—not yet consecrated,—but solely to the offertory, is proved by the rubric, which says, "if there be no alms or oblations, then shall the words be left out." Here, then, is a manifest attempt to pervert the plain meaning of the Prayer Book; while in the lengthened passages quoted above, there is much more that approaches closely to the very errors and superstitions which the Fathers of our Church disavowed, even at the stake.

AN ARTICLE EXPLAINED !

But this is not all. To the passage on "the office of the earthly priest," already quoted from p. 19, a professed explanation of the 28th Article of the Book of Common Prayer is thus appended in a note, in reference to the words "without change of substance."

"The reader is advised to study carefully Article xxviii., especially its third paragraph. There the Body of Christ is not only said to be 'eaten,' but also to be 'given,' viz., in the hand of the minister; 'taken,' viz., from his hand, by the receiver. Hence *the Lord's body is there, independently of the faith or conduct of the receiver.*" p. 19.

On p. 197 is a warning that "your English Bible is but a translation of the Scriptures, made more than 260 years ago." The misinterpreting it by the people who cannot read it in the original language, the reader is told, "is the great reason why *schism* is so prevalent;" and so in case of doubt, he is told, "do not run to commentaries for yourself, for there are few reliable. Get your Parish Priest to illustrate the passage for you from the rest of the Bible, and from the Prayer Book." But the Thirty-nine Articles are in the plain English in which they were originally presented for the guidance of simple-minded Christians. If the above is a sample of the way in which the Bible or the Articles are to be interpreted by our Parish Priests, we fear that "schism" is not likely to diminish in prevalence.

ADVICE TO THE READER.

We also give the same advice to the reader: Study carefully the paragraph of Article xxviii. referred to, and compare it with the above interpretation. Here it is:—

"The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is Faith."

Is it possible more deliberately to falsify words than to present to the youthful mind as a true inference from the above: "Hence the Lord's body is there, *independently of the faith or conduct of the receiver?*"

The rubric at the end of the Communion service, guarding against any such assumption, and its superstitious consequence, says, in language expressive of the same idea as has been already quoted from Cranmer:—"The Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

Further, as if to preclude the possibility of such an unscriptural idea, such a return to mediæval superstition, as that the Lord's Body is there, *i.e.* in the bread; and that too, "independently of the faith or conduct of the receiver;" we read in another rubric appended to the "Communion of the Sick," that if, by any impediment, the sick man desiring to partake of the Holy Communion:—"Do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the Curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed his Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

We quoted before this passage:—

At p. 94, the young Communicant is thus instructed at the celebration:—"Concentrate, as far as possible, all your thoughts upon the service. . . . You will find it engrossing enough to follow the priest closely in the service. *Be especially careful to do this during the 'Prayer of Consecration,' for it is then particularly that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is being made, and the Sacrifice of the Cross pleaded for our sins.*" We now append it to another passage from p. 15, to which the Lord Bishop refers us as that by which it is to be explained. It is demanding too much of any boy or girl, to place before them, without explanation or reference, so misleading an instruction, and expect them to bear in remembrance any explanation, however clear, which occurs some eighty pages off. But here is the supposed antidote, quoted still more fully than his lordship has done:—

wou
ten
bec
Con
Red
brea
same
23-2

Man

brati
inde
the p
the le
surely
food o
hund
that c
food o

Book

"We must carefully keep in mind that the sacrifice offered on the Christian Altar is the counterpart, *not* of the *slaying* of the GREAT VICTIM upon the Cross (for that can never be repeated in any sense whatever), but of the perpetual presentation by CHRIST in Heaven, of His Sacrifice on the Cross. He thus 'ever lives to make intercession for us,' seeing that He 'abideth a priest for ever,' and must therefore 'have somewhat to offer.'

"As He there, by Himself in Person, pleads His Great Sacrifice, once for all offered, yet ever efficacious, so obtaining pardon for the sins of all who are penitent so does He the same, and with the same efficacy, here on earth in the person of His commissioned priest, in the Eucharistic setting forth of His Death."

To us, this and much else in the Manual, however obscurely stated, appears calculated, if not purposely designed, to mislead the youthful mind, and inevitably to prepare the way for the reception of the idea that the ministers of the Church of England are sacrificing priests, making an offering upon an altar, as the priests of the Church of Rome claim to be and to do.

FASTING COMMUNION.

Another instruction given to the youthful Communicant, would startle the simple Protestant's mind by its unmistakable tendency towards the same approximation to Rome, had we not become familiar with this revival of the Romish idea of a fasting Communion, so utterly opposed to the example of our Divine Redeemer, who, "the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, brake it. . . . After the same manner also he took the cup, *when he had supped*," (1 Cor. xii. 23-25.) This, the Apostle writes, "I have received of the Lord."

Here is the utterly diverse teaching of the "Christian's Manual:"—

"Should it be possible, always choose to attend an early celebration rather than one at noon; and this for several reasons; for, independently of the quiet and stillness of the early morning, and the probability of being free from distraction or weariness through the length of the service if you attend after morning prayer: it is surely most fitting that this Holy Sacrament should be the *first* food of which you partake. Indeed, there was a rule adopted, many hundred years ago, in a great council of the Church, which enjoined that communicants should receive fasting, that is, before they tasted food on the day of Communion." p. 2.

To this we shall only add that the names given in our Prayer Book are "THE LORD'S SUPPER, or HOLY COMMUNION." We have

yet to discover any good reason for substituting for either, "THE HOLY EUCHARIST," or any other medieval revival.

MISLEADING IDEAS.

It might seem scarcely necessary, after what has been thus set forth in such detail, to notice the accompanying hymns,—justly characterized by the Lord Bishop as "touching and beautiful;" and the majority of them, moreover, unobjectionable. When indeed one reads again and again such advice as this.—

"If there is no church near you, that is no excuse for going to schismatical preaching, for you can read your Prayer Book and Bible at home for the time of service, and other good books afterward," p.34; or the warning on p.35 against "those whose authority is traced back to a merely humanly originated sect or set of men,"—it almost provokes a smile to find inserted here, for example, the beautiful hymn of the Rev. Horatius Bonar—(if it be pardonable, after such a warning, to call a Scottish Presbyterian Minister *Reverend*) :—

I heard the voice of Jesus say,
Come unto me and rest.

But unhappily along with beautiful hymns such as this, we find others of a very different character, such as are illustrated here:

'Tis His Word to our receiving
Makes the bread His Flesh to be,
And the wine, our souls relieving,
Blood that flowed upon the tree ;
Though not seeing, yet believing,
Take we the Great Mystery.

Unto this, His Presence veiled,
Draw we near with hearts bowed low ;
All that ancient rites entailed
Yield to higher blessings now ;
Earthly touch and sight have failed,
Faith adores nor questions how.

The very same misleading idea is thus presented in the still more objectionable form of prayer :—

"Grant, Holy Jesus, that as I have now received in faith Thy precious Body and Blood, veiled under the form of bread and wine, I may hereafter behold Thy Blessed Face unveiled in Heaven, who with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST livest and reignest one God, world without end. Amen." P. 99.

Take the above hymn and prayer together, and wherein do they differ from the language of Bennett, the most notorious Ritualistic stirrer up of strife in all England:—"who myself adore, and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament, under the form

of bread and wine, believing that under this veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Again, we regard the following advice as a complete perversion of the design of the Reforming Fathers of the Church of England, in forbidding any portion of the consecrated Bread and Wine to be "reserved," as contrary to "Christ's Ordinance." This was to put an end to the superstitious medieval practices of keeping "The Host" upon the Altar, and carrying it about in procession. We much fear the use here made of it is not less likely to engender superstition, by leading the mind of the Young Communicant away from the Living Christ, and the living faith of the true Believer, to the mere outward and visible signs, as a means of Grace:—

"Join reverently and heartily in the concluding portion of the service, and then be in no haste to depart; remember that there may be portions of the Holy Elements still to be consumed. The Church directs the minister to call any of those present to aid him herein. Should you be called, receive 'reverently', as the Prayer Book directs; kneel down, remembering how holy is that which you receive; then wait till the officiating ministers have left the sanctuary before you quit the House of God where you have been so blest." P. 100.

GROSS ERROR.

Such then are samples of the teaching of this Manual. Yet copious as they are, they by no means exhaust the evidence of its erroneous and strange teachings. A special appendix is devoted to the justification from scripture of "the use of the words 'Altar' and 'sacrifice' and 'offering' in speaking of the Holy Table of the Lord."

The young Communicant is taught to revive an ancient custom, to which his Prayer Book certainly lends no countenance, apart from this still stranger addition: "When you receive the Holy Bread—the BODY of your SAVIOUR,—receive it not in your *fingers*, but into your hand. It is a very ancient and most becoming custom, to cross the hands one upon the other, and receive the Sacrament into the open palm of the right hand. This is done in order that no part of the Holy Thing may fall to the ground, as will happen if you take it between your thumb and finger."

Still further to confirm the young Communicant in the grossest error, the very next line reads:—"When you receive THE BODY OF THE LORD, say: &c."

So then our children are henceforth to be taught that the bread which they receive into their hand is THE BODY OF CHRIST.

It is perhaps scarcely worth while after this to refer to the instructions, for the Friday before Communion :—

“ On this day you ought to make your self examination, *going, if possible, to the Church to do so. There you will not only be in the more immediate presence of God, but you will also be able to do it with more solemnity.*” P. 79.

Where, either in his Bible or his Prayer Book, will the young Christian learn that he is “ *in the more immediate presence of God* ” in a Church, than when kneeling alone by his own bed-side ?

THE ROOT OF RITUALISM.

Such, then, is this so-called “Christian’s Manual.” The one prominent aim of its teaching is that which lies at the root of Ritualism, viz., the substitution for the doctrine of “justification by Faith only ;” as clearly set forth in the Eleventh Article, a revival, in a modified form, of the Romish doctrine of justification by the Sacraments of the Church. The unmistakable aim manifestly is to represent the Lord’s Supper rather as a means to secure the benefits of Christ’s death to the recipient of the material elements of bread and wine, than as a Sacramental memorial of his Divine Sacrifice, made once for all. On this our Prayer Book is as clear as it is Scriptural : “To the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding he hath obtained to us ; he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort.”

It is this thankful renewal of our faith in Christ as our living Saviour—the true scriptural teaching,—which is every where prominent in our most beautiful Communion Service. The minister in delivering the bread to the Communicant is instructed to say :—“The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.” How striking is the contrast between this simple, beautiful, scriptural language, and the mystical, erroneous teachings of this Manual, which is now being placed in the hands of our children as the teaching of the Bible, of the Church, and of the Book of Common Prayer.

Valuing as of priceless worth, as a heritage to our children, the pure faith and doctrine of the Protestant Church of England, we appeal to Christian parents, fellow-members with us of the same Church, and ask if this is the kind of teaching they desire their children to receive ?

We have said that "the tree is known by its fruits," and that we can only judge of the Theological Teaching of Trinity College by its results. Those efforts at the indoctrinating of the rising generation in the very essence of Ritualism cannot be accidental. It is not so long since the Rev. J. Langtry, a graduate of Trinity College, introduced the very same kind of teaching in the Strachan Church School. The "Christian's Manual," which is here shown in its true character, is the work of another graduate of the same College. The school for which he has been selected as a master, is styled "Trinity College School, Port Hope." It is the training school of Trinity College, and as such has foremost on the list of its "Governing Body," Hon. J. H. Cameron, Chancellor of that University; the Rev. the Provost; and its two other professors, the Rev. Prof. Ambery and the Rev. Prof. Jones. The examinations are conducted by the latter three, and the religious instruction constitutes the special department to which the Rev. Provost's oversight is directed. In so far, therefore, as Trinity College as a Theological Institution, selects, or sanctions and countenances the selection from among its graduates, of the author of this Manual, as a clergyman fit to be entrusted with the religious instruction of the youth in its preparatory school, it stamps the character of its own teaching. Until it gives practical evidence of its disavowal of such erroneous and dangerous teachings on the very central doctrines of the Christian faith, alike by forbidding the use of the obnoxious book, and by removing its author from so responsible a trust, we must continue to regard Trinity College as "depraving the Church," as an unsafe institution for the religious training of young men, and especially of aspirants to the ministry.

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

One more comment of the Lord Bishop calls for notice here. In his letter to the Church Association he says:—"That Association might have spared themselves the scandal of their Paper No. VII., which has awakened the indignation and disgust of thousands of loyal and consistent members of the Church in this diocese, and far beyond its precincts."

That "the scandal" which that Paper exposed has awakened indignation in the minds of loyal churchmen we can well believe. We now own it, as a duty to the Church, no less than to this Association, to say that the statements therein set forth were produced after the most careful enquiry; we believe them to be strictly true, and capable of legal proof.

Members and Corresponding Members:—Yearly subscriptions, One Dollar; Life Members, Donation of Twenty-five Dollars.

The papers of the C. A. may be obtained by Members, for distribution, free, from either of the Honorary Secretaries, B. Homer Dixon or John Gillespie; to whom those desirous of joining the Association will please send their names, addresses and subscriptions.

The papers may be purchased at \$1.00 per fifty, 30 cents per dozen, or five cents each, from Hart & Rawlinson, Booksellers, 3 King Street West, Toronto.

scriptions,
llars.

ers, for dis-

B. Homer

joining the
scriptions.

0 cents per
booksellers, 3